



1715 Aaron Brenner Drive, Suite 800
Memphis, Tennessee 38120-4367
901.537.1000
Fax: 901.537.1010

Mail: P.O. Box 775000
Memphis, Tennessee 38177-5000

H. Roy Berkenstock
Direct Phone: 901-537-1108
E-mail: rberkenstock@wyattfirm.com

September 8, 2005

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Re: U.S. Patent Application Ser. No. 10/634,204
Applicant: Kim Marie Clark
Filed: 8/5/2003
For: Adhesive Cord Cover

Dear Sir:

Enclosed are:

1. Transmittal letter;
2. Amendment (10 pages), which includes Certificate of Mailing; and
3. Firm return receipt post card

Respectfully submitted,

H. Roy Berkenstock
Reg. No. 24,719

/lv
Enclosures

317270.4

www.wyattfirm.com

250 West Main Street, Suite 1600
Lexington, KY 40507-1746
859.233.2012

918 State Street
Bowling Green, KY 42101
270.842.1050

1715 Aaron Brenner Drive, Suite 800
Memphis, TN 38120-4367
901.537.1000

500 West Jefferson Street, Suite 2800
Louisville, KY 40202-2898
502.589.5235

311 West Main Street
Frankfort, KY 40601-1807
502.223.2104

2525 West End Avenue, Suite 1500
Nashville, TN 37203-1423
615.244.0020

101 West Spring Street, Suite 500
New Albany, IN 47150-3610
812.945.3561



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant:

Kim Marie Clark

Filed: **August 5, 2003**

Serial No. **10/634,204**

For: **ADHESIVE CORD COVER**

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Art Unit: **3765**

Examiner: **Ahmad, Nasser**

Attorney Docket No.: **317270.4/A0220145US**

AMENDMENT

Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant acknowledge receipt of the Office Action issued in the above identified application on February 3, 2005. Applicant appreciates the thorough review of the subject of the invention and the assessment of the prior art in the rejection of claims 1 through 10.

The Rejections

Claims 1 and 5 - 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ratzlaff (5,099,889), and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious based upon Padilla (5,869,159) in view of Petock.

Claims 1 - 3 and 5 - 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratzlaff in view of Simmons (5,964,252)

Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratzlaff in view of Tomberlin (4,939,778).

In respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 5 - 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) it is well known that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. MPEP §2131. Further, the identical invention must be shown - in as complete detail as in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki*